

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

MARAINA ARIK,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,

Defendant.

Case No: C 08-5564 SBA

Related to: C 04-4932 SBA

**ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT
AND RECOMMENDATION OF
MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The Court previously referred Plaintiff's motion for attorney's fees to the Chief Magistrate Judge or her designee for the preparation of a report and recommendation. On April 21, 2011, Magistrate Judge Laurel Beeler issued her report and recommendation in which she recommended granting Plaintiff's motion and awarding Plaintiff the following amounts: \$5,117.56 in attorney's fees; \$3,660 in paralegal time; \$165 for clerical time; and \$60.02 in costs. Dkt. 44 at 10. Any objections to a report and recommendation must be filed within fourteen days of receipt thereof. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Civ. L.R. 72-2, 72-3. The district court must "make a de novo determination of those portions of the report to which objection is made," and "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Civ. L.R. 72-3(a) (requiring that any objections be accompanied by a motion for de novo determination).

No objections have been filed in this case, and the deadline for filing an objection has passed. In the absence of a timely objection, the Court "need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory Committee Notes (1983) (citing Campbell v. U.S. Dist. Court, 501 F.2d 196, 206 (9th Cir. 1974)); see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114,

1 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (“The statute [28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C)] makes it clear that the district
2 judge must review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations de novo *if [an]*
3 *objection is made*, but not otherwise.”) (en banc). The Court has reviewed the record on its
4 face and finds no clear error. Accordingly,

5 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the magistrate judge’s report and
6 recommendation (Docket 44) is ACCEPTED and shall become the Order of this Court.
7 Plaintiff shall be awarded the sum of \$9,002.58, as set forth above. The Clerk shall
8 terminate all pending matters.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: June 21, 2011


SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG
United States District Judge